

Final report for project 100841-006, consultancy contract #107337

By Philippa Wiens

March, 2003

Within the parameters of this consultancy contract, three main activities were undertaken:

1. Project communication with IDRC partners participating in MINGA's Gender and NRM Master Thesis' support project. This involved correspondence with key partners for project development, and review of technical reports.
2. Project communication with partner for MINGA's project "Confronting the Challenge of Gender Equity in Environmental Management in Latin America" (IUCN). This included correspondence and review of initial monitoring reports for the project.
3. Design and development of the evaluation matrix for the formative evaluation of MINGA's gender mainstreaming efforts to date (from January of 2000). (See Appendix A for the Matrix.)

In the case of project assistance for both the Master's gender and NRM thesis project and the IUCN Gender Equity project, activities were carried out in collaboration with MINGA's team leader Simon Carter. Assistance was provided on the basis of past activities with these partners, and within the context of on-going project development.

With regards to the development of the Evaluation Matrix for MINGA's gender mainstreaming evaluation, the matrix was developed to reflect the strategies and commitments of the MINGA team for gender mainstreaming during the period under review. Development of the matrix built on the consultant's past experience working with the MINGA team in the design and implementation of gender mainstreaming within the program.

The evaluation matrix will serve as the basis for MINGA's gender mainstreaming evaluation, to be undertaken by Abra Adamo, and to be completed in August of 2003.

The Evaluation Matrix is presented in Appendix A. Details about the issues to be taken up in the evaluation is included in Appendix B.

APPENDIX A

MINGA GENDER MAINSTREAMING EVALUATION GRID

Philippa Wiens, January 2003

SINCE JANUARY OF 2000...

Key evaluation issues	Evaluation questions	Indicator of change [information sought]	Info Source
MINGA IN-HOUSE GENDER CAPACITY BUILDING AND LEARNING			
1. PI staff feel competent to address gender issues in the work they support.	<p>i) Do PO's feel capable of engaging partners in dialogue about gender issues?</p> <p>ii) Do PO's feel comfortable recommending gender analysis (GA) and discussing GA methodology with partners?</p> <p>iii) Do PO's feel comfortable with engaging their partners in dialogue about gender issues and the uptake of gender considerations in the project?</p>	<p>i) PO's engaging partners in dialogue/ discussion about gender issues a) at the beginning of the project, and b) throughout the project (monitoring). (See Point 6)</p> <p>ii) PO perceptions of their comfort levels, as compared to pre-January 2000.</p> <p>iii) PO perceptions of comfort levels, as compared to pre-January 2000.</p> <p>Learning:</p> <p>a) What were the key factors which contributed to PO's enhanced sense of competency about gender and NRM?</p> <p>b) Current knowledge-enhancement needs?</p>	<p>i) See Point 6 ii (TRIPs, Gender monitoring reports -GMRs)</p> <p>ii) PO interviews</p> <p>iii) PO interviews</p> <p>- PO Interviews</p>
2. PI supports and encourages capacity building /training about GA and gender knowledge among PI staff (in-house).	<p>i) What modalities have been put in place to support PI staff capacity-building?</p> <p>ii) How effective have these modalities been?</p> <p>Learning: What are current needs for capacity building/ training?</p>	<p>i) Modalities put in place to support PO capacity-building and learning. (Gender workshop and gender monitoring reports.)</p> <p>ii) Effectiveness of these modalities:</p> <p>a) Extent to which PO's feel that their gender and NRM knowledge has increased (and /or is sufficient) as a result of these modalities.</p> <p>b) Extent to which PO's feel comfort levels have been enhanced (as a result).</p> <p>Learning: PO perceptions of current capacity-building needs, and suggestions for meeting these needs.</p>	<p>i) Program docs.</p> <p>ii) PO interviews. (RO?)</p> <p>- PO interviews.</p>

MINGA/ PO SUPPORT TO PARTNERS FOR INTEGRATION OF GENDER CONSIDERATIONS INTO RESEARCH PROJECTS			
5. PO's provide support and encouragement to partners for integrating gender considerations into their research. (Note: The focus is on PO's ; not on partners.)	<p>i) Are PO's encouraging partners to address gender considerations in their research?</p> <p>ii) Are partners needs for GA being addressed by the PO (as identified via PO assessment of GA capacity of the partner)?</p> <p>iii) Are PO's linking partners up with local gender capacity / expertise?</p> <p>iv) Are PO's encouraging partners to take up training for GA where appropriate?</p> <p><u>Learning:</u></p> <p>a) What are continued challenges to addressing partner needs re: integration of gender considerations? How might these challenges be addressed (including at the program level)?</p> <p>b) To date, what have been 'successes'? What has worked, and what has not re: supporting partners to integrate gender considerations? Why or why not? (Lessons)</p>	<p>i) The extent to which (# of projects where) gender is explicitly addressed in project proposals (ideally should be 100% for new projects since 2000)</p> <p>b) Awareness level of PO's about GA as part of project research on the ground (not just on paper). (As compared to Jan '00.)</p> <p>ii) a) Where need identified, PO's providing concrete recommendations and suggestions to partners for addressing needs re: GA (as reported in TRIPs and PAD).</p> <p>b) <u>Learning:</u> Challenges? Insights?</p> <p>iii) Extent to which PO's are linking partners with local gender expertise and resources (who and what).</p> <p>iv) (Extent to which) PO's are informing partners of available MINGA modalities for partner and research team capacity-building (ex. Training).</p> <p><u>Learning:</u> PO perceptions, and suggestions for strengthening support to partners.</p>	<p>a) Proposal and PAD docs for all new projects since Jan '00</p> <p>b) PO interviews</p> <p>ii) a) PAD and TRIPs; gender monitoring reports (GMRs)</p> <p>b) PO interviews</p> <p>iii) GMRs. TRIPs (see 4.iv)</p> <p>iv) Gender monitoring reports, TRIPs.</p> <p>- PO interviews</p>
6. Gender considerations are being integrated into every phase of the project cycle.	<p>i) Do PO's systematically assess and report research team capacity for GA and project gender considerations?</p> <p>ii) Are PO's engaging partners in dialogue about gender from start of project?</p> <p>iv) Are PO's monitoring gender throughout the project?</p> <p>v) Are PO's reporting (/recording) learning with regards to the uptake of gender considerations in the project?</p>	<p>i) a) For new projects since Jan 2000, extent to which PO's undertake and report research team capacity for GA and project gender considerations.</p> <p>b) <u>Learning:</u> How is GA assessment carried out? What information is sought and how? Challenges? Insights?</p> <p>ii) a) The extent to which PO's are engaging partners in dialogue about gender from the start of project development. (Ideally, 100% for all new projects since Jan 2000).</p> <p>b) <u>Learning:</u> What are issues, concerns and insights with regards to engaging partners in dialogue?</p> <p>iv) Gender issues traced/ monitored throughout the project; reported in TRIP reports.</p> <p>v) Extent to which gender issues and lessons reported. (PCR? GMRs? Elsewhere?)</p>	<p>i) a) TRIP reports, PAD review</p> <p>b) PO interviews</p> <p>ii) a) TRIP reports; GMRs</p> <p>b) PO interviews</p> <p>iv) TRIP reports</p> <p>v) Doc review; PO interviews</p>

APPENDIX B

GENDER MAINSTREAMING EVALUATION FOR THE MINGA PI: PRELIMINARY OUTLINE

October, 2002
Philippa Wiens

Objectives of the evaluation:

- 1) To determine the changes which have taken place in the MINGA PI (re programming and PO behaviour) with regards to integrating a gender perspective into MINGA's work (since January of 2000).
- 2) To assess the usefulness of the gender monitoring tool and improvements or changes thereof;
- 3) To inform possible changes or refinements with regards to gender mainstreaming activity (the aggregate of PI staff suggestions and my own observations);
- 4) To capture learning and insights with regards to gender mainstreaming activities.

Methodology: Document review of TRIPS, PADS and project documents. Interviews with PO's.

Subjects of the evaluation: MINGA team members. MINGA PI.

The evaluation is intended to be a *formative* evaluation, seeking to assess changes and learning which has taken place within the PI and among PI members, as per the team's goal to mainstream gender into its programming (seeking, ultimately, to promote greater gender equity through its projects.) Being formative in nature, the evaluation is intended to inform further learning and to make recommendations (as gathered from team members) for continued learning and integration of a gender perspective into the work of the PI.

The evaluation is *not* evaluating the impact of the PI's gender mainstreaming with regards to the impact on partners; the impact of addressing gender dimensions of NRM through projects. This is a longer term activity, for which an evaluation is planned to take place in 2005. The evaluation will focus on to what extent changes have taken place among team members and programming.

It should be noted that of 7 program officers, there is one senior program officer who is female, and one project officer who is female (as of September of 2002). The remaining five senior program officers are male.

Changes to track within the MINGA PI:

With regards to:

- **PO (in-house) Knowledge about gender and NRM**, and 'comfort' levels with engaging partners in dialogue about gender and NRM (in-house capacity-building and gender training issue): Over the 1.5 yrs, training needs identified and some of these met (review training needs synthesis developed for the GSU). The evaluation should find out *how useful this training was, if further 'training' is needed*, and what current comfort levels are (compared to minimum comfort levels as assessed in January of 2000). * Speaks to the MINGA strategy of increasing in-house capacity.
- **Integration of gender into** all phases of the **project** cycle: - The extent to which PO's are bringing gender up 'right from the beginning' of project development. Sources: TRIP reports, PO interviews (Overall, PO's judge that...) – How do PO's assess gender –capacity in the research team? Do they feel they are able to do this accurately? – *Any interesting observations with regards to different ways of understanding gender issues as per Partners' world views and perceptions? Ever a clash between PO understanding/ worldview and partner worldview?* – The extent to which gender issues are addressed throughout project development (TRIP reports). – monitoring issues: Gender issues checked out in monitoring (TRIP reports)? - The extent to which gender is explicitly addressed in projects (Projects and project docs: Number of projects where gender is explicitly an issue. Compared to projects previous to Jan 2000?) Are PO's aware of the extent to which the gender dimensions of the research is in fact being addressed on the ground? (In my base-line study/ assessment in 2000, PO awareness was very low; many PO's were simply not aware of what was really going on the ground; whether the gender activity which was claimed to take place in the project documents was in fact happening/ being operationalized on the ground...) * Speaks to MINGA strategy of integrating gender into project cycle, as well as to the strategy of promoting gender sensitive research.
- **Gender sensitive research**: As per info gathered with regards to the integration of gender into project cycle, are ALL projects now 'gender sensitive'? To what degree?
- **Number and quality of Gender projects**: (Include dollar amounts per project? = total \$ of portfolio spent on gender projects?) * Speaks to MINGA strategy of promoting gender projects; projects focused on gender issues.
- **Female research project leaders**: Number of project leaders who are female, and type of projects. (Ex. Julia Fraga: COSTA. MA project. Susan Poats, Manrecur. Others?) - Speaks to the issue of gender equity and to MINGA strategy of supporting women researchers, and feminist networks.
- **Composition of research teams**: Female vs male members. Social science vs natural science...
- **Linking up with/ supporting local women's groups, orgs and networks**: To what extent is this happening (PO interviews and TRIP reports)? *Should it be happening?* Should more of this be happening? Who are our partners (as compared to Jan 2000)?
- **Knowledge of activity and who's who on the ground**: Has PO (and PI) knowledge of who is doing what re; Gender and NRM improved? Do PO's feel they have a better sense of what is going on and are better able to draw on this activity? Are there examples of this activity being drawn upon (yes: MA project and IUCN project are two examples, as well as VVG

resources; access to training, and issues faced by research team members for integrating this perspective); - integrating a gender perspective into the project cycle (including how gender is most effectively integrated; where it is most likely to make a difference); - promoting gender-sensitive research (is this happening? Why or why not?); - promoting research on gender issues; (- linking up with women's groups).

NOTE: Learnings can be gleaned from analysis of the Gender Monitoring reports, in addition to PO interviews. These learnings might be shared with other PI's and IDRC generally.

With regards to initial obstacles to comfort levels for PO's (as outlined in MVD session document, p.4 and 5), are these still concerns that need to be addressed? – Fear of cultural imposition, - visible and explicit team gender commitment (done), - lack of awareness gender and NRM activity in the region, - social/ gender analysis difficult to implement with certain types of partners (how is this being overcome by PO's?), - lack of tools to recommend to partners, - need for dialogue to assess partner vision of gender (this is now taking place on a regular basis?).

In the final document, note the difference between PO perceptions of what is happening at programming level, at team level, with projects overall, and among colleagues re: gender, and what is actually happening, as per 'evidence' in documents.